

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1 – 24.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Serbinis et al. (US# 6,584,466 B1, “Serbinis”). Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-24 are not anticipated by Serbinis.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of an “account (stored on a remote server) reserved for a second handheld device and describing a complement of information stored in said second handheld device” as recited by Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis is silent as to storing information on a server about files stored in any other device.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further, the passage cited in the rejection of Claim 1 teaches “[d]atabase 25... stores: data concerning documents controlled by server computer 20 and stored in store 30,” which is in contrast to claimed limitations. By teaching that a server’s database stores information concerning documents stored on the server, Serbinis actually teaches away from embodiments in accordance with the present invention as recited in Claim 1 that recite a server storing information

related to a handheld device. Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis' teaching a list of contents of database 25 that does not including information regarding a handheld device teaches away from an account on a server "describing a complement of information stored in said second handheld device" as recited by Claim 1.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of:

 said remote server automatically determining, from said account, that said information is new to said second handheld device and in response thereto for automatically downloading said information to said second handheld device

as recited by Claim 1. In contrast, Serbinis teaches:

 At step 86, notification server 35 generates notification messages to the Authorized Users informing those Users that the document is available in store 30 (column 9, lines 50-52)

and "[a]uthorized Users may then initiate User Sessions to retrieve the document" (column 10 lines 42-43). Thus, Serbinis teaches an open loop, manual method comprising an open loop notification "for example... an e-mail message or voice message" (column 9 line 63) and a manually initiated User Session. As such, Serbinis actually teaches away from embodiments in accordance with the

present invention as recited in Claim 1 that recite “automatic... downloading” responsive to “determining... that said information is new.”

For this still additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 2, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “said first handheld device sending said remote server a token identifying said information and said second handheld and wherein said token causes said account to be modified by said remote server” as recited by Claim 2. Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not even utilize the word “token” or similar terms. The portion of Serbinis cited in the rejection refers to Java “servlets.” Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a Java “servlet” is not equivalent to a token as recited in Claim 2.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 2 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 4, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “wherein said information is a version of an application program” as recited by Claim 4. Applicants

respectfully assert that Serbinis is directed to a “document management system” (Abstract). Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that an electronic document is not equivalent to “an application program” as recited in Claim 4.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 4 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

The rejection of Claim 4 alleges that Serbinis’ “Document Management System (DMS) is adapted to manage applications stored as applications files (i.e. zip, exe).” Applicants have carefully reviewed Serbinis and do not find such teaching. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically cite such teaching, or to withdraw the rejection of this Claim.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 4 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 4, Serbinis teaches “an electronic document to be stored is created by an Originator using a previously known word processing, image or spreadsheet client application” (column 8, lines 64-66). Such client applications are well known to not generate “application programs” as recited in Claim 4. Consequently, Serbinis actually teaches away from embodiments in accordance with the present invention as recited in Claim 4.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 4 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 5, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “wherein said account comprises an application version record table comprising an entry for each application stored in said second handheld device” as recited by Claim 5.

Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, suggest or disclose storing any information on the server about files stored in any device. The cited Serbinis passage refers to information stored on the server regarding documents also stored on the server.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 5 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 10, Applicants respectfully assert that Serbinis does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “a synchronization process between said remote server and said second handheld device” as recited by Claim 10. Applicants respectfully assert that “synchronization” is a well known term of art, and that Serbinis silent as to a synchronization process. The passage cited in the rejection of Claim 10 refers to “notification information tables (that) maintain information necessary to generate a notification message.” Applicants respectfully assert that “notification information tables” do not teach, suggest or disclose a “synchronization process” as recited by Claim 10.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 10 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 12 overcomes the rejections of record for the same rationale presented previously with respect to Claim 1. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 13-20 depend from Claim 12. Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 13, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 13 overcomes the rejections of record for the same rationale presented previously with respect to Claim 2. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 15, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 15 overcomes the rejections of record for the same rationale presented previously with respect to Claim 4. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 21, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 21 overcomes the rejections of record for the same rationale presented previously with respect to Claim 1. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 22-24 depend from Claim 21. Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1 – 24.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Applicants have reviewed the following references that were cited but not relied upon and do not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: US 6,446,093, US 2001/0032188 and US 6,748,447.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 11/4/2004


Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060